



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

March 24, 2006

To: Mayor Michael D. Antonovich
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe

From: David E. Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

SACRAMENTO UPDATE

Legislation of Interest to the County

AB 2015 (Lieu), as amended on March 21, 2006, would reconfigure the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Governing Board by adding four additional city representatives to the existing Board. One new member would be appointed by each of the city selection committees in Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, and one new appointment by the City of Los Angeles. This would bring the total Board members to 16, of which four would be representatives from within Los Angeles County.

Under existing law, the SCAQMD Governing Board consists of 12 members. Of these, four are county supervisors representing Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties. Five of the members are City Council members representing the cities in each county, of which two represent cities within Los Angeles County. The representation of the Los Angeles County cities is derived through a selection process comprised of one representative from the "eastern region" of the County and one from the "western region." The remaining three Board members are appointed by the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and by the Senate Rules Committee.

AB 2015 also adjusts the city selection process in Los Angeles County by adding the Cities of Calabasas and Malibu and excluding Los Angeles from the list of cities included in the western region of the County. Further, the bill would authorize the

eastern and western regions of the County to meet jointly in order to change the lists of cities to be included in each region. Apparently, some cities that were incorporated after the passage of legislation authorizing air quality districts are classified as being included in the eastern region when they should be in the western region and vice versa.

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) is sponsoring AB 2015. The SBCCOG consists of the following cities: Carson, El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Palos Verdes Estates, Torrance, and the Harbor City/San Pedro areas of the City of Los Angeles. The SBCCOG indicated that it has no issues with the quality of representation they have received on the SCAQMD Board, but they would prefer a seat at the table. They are concerned the cities in the western region of Los Angeles County would have no opportunity to be represented if they disagreed with the region's current representative, the City of Los Angeles.

AB 2015 is set for hearing in the Assembly Local Government Committee on April 5, 2006. Other than the sponsor of the bill, there is no known support. The bill is opposed by the SCAQMD.

Video Franchise Legislation

There appears to be increasing activity regarding legislation to address the issue of Statewide franchising of video services. At issue is the interest of the telephone companies, such as AT&T (formerly SBC) and Verizon, to change State law to provide them greater latitude to compete in the video marketplace which is currently and primarily occupied by cable companies. These actions have the potential to alter the authority of local government to regulate and grant franchise agreements.

Thus far, two bills, **AB 2987 (Nuñez and Levine)** and **SB 850 (Escutia)**, have been positioned as potential legislative vehicles. Introduced on February 24, 2006, AB 2987 is a spot or placeholder bill that specifies the Legislature's intent to create the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006. The bill has not been referred to a committee.

SB 850, as amended on February 22, 2006, is a spot bill too, but includes a number of findings and declarations that aim to: 1) encourage fair competition, 2) ensure access to service is not denied to any area because of the income of the residents, 3) provide a State-issued franchise alternative to current local franchise agreements where a franchisee would pay a five percent franchise fee in lieu of other local franchise obligations, and 4) not to alter local governmental control of the rights of way regarding the construction of telephone lines by telephone corporations. The bill has been

referred to the Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce; however, no hearing date has been set.

Given the potential impacts on the County, the County's advocates are working with the California State Association of Counties, and other interested groups to ensure local control is preserved and related revenues are protected.

Status of County-Interest Legislation

County-supported AB 1785 (Bermudez), which would increase the amount required to be budgeted for allocation to grade separation projects from \$15 million to \$70 million annually, passed the Assembly Transportation Committee on Tuesday, March 21, 2006, by a vote of 11 to 0, and now proceeds to the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

According to the Transportation Committee analysis, a \$55 million increase in funding for grade separations could potentially decrease funds available in the State Highway Account for other purposes. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is looking into this issue to determine if any of their other funding would be negatively impacted by an increase in funding for grade separations. If DPW determines that they will be negatively impacted in other areas, the County will drop support for this measure and take a position of support, if amended, to ensure that regional transit programs are not harmed and the funding received by DPW from the California Department of Transportation or from gas tax revenues is not reduced. In the meantime, the County will continue to support AB 1785 until further notice.

County-supported, if amended, AB 1873 (Torrico), as amended in the Assembly Public Safety Committee on March 21, 2006 would: 1) raise the age at which an infant can be surrendered from 72 hours old or younger to up to 30 days; 2) expand the definition of a Safe Surrender site to include a local fire agency upon the approval of the appropriate governing body; 3) specify that a Safe Surrender site or personnel at the Safe Surrender site shall have no liability for a surrendered child; 4) appropriate \$5 million to the California Department of Social Services to conduct a statewide awareness campaign publicizing the existence of safe-surrender sites; and 5) require the State to establish and operate a toll-free telephone number to provide information and assistance to the public regarding Safe Surrender sites. The bill passed the committee by a vote of 4 to 1, and now proceeds to the Assembly Human Services Committee.

County-opposed SB 926 (Florez), which would have permitted the Kern County Board of Supervisors to adopt an ordinance to regulate or prohibit the land application of sewage sludge in the unincorporated areas of Kern County, was amended on Tuesday, March 21, 2006 in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

As amended, SB 926 would require the completion and certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) on a proposed solid waste facility that informs the voters of the project's scope and impact on the environment before a local initiative that proposes to amend a city or county's general plan or zoning ordinance to allow the siting of a solid waste facility may be placed on the ballot. The county, in which the solid waste facility is proposed to be sited, is the lead agency, and would be required to make the EIR publicly available at the county's headquarters and on the Internet. DPW is currently reviewing the amended version of the bill to determine its impact upon the department and County operations and whether or not an oppose position is still warranted.

We will continue to keep you advised.

DEJ:GK
MAL:JF:IGR:cc

c: Local 660
All Department Heads
Legislative Strategist
Coalition of County Unions
California Contract Cities Association
Independent Cities Association
League of California Cities
City Managers Associations
Buddy Program Participants